

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
21 June 1967

INDEX

	<u>Page</u>
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u>	
1. Approval of Minutes	1
2. Corcoran Gallery of Art	1
<u>SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS</u>	
1. <u>National Capital Transportation Agency</u>	
Subway Designs	1-2
2. <u>General Services Administration, Public Buildings Svc.</u>	
a. F.B.I. Building - Revised Design	2
b. National Zoological Park, Multi-Climate Bldg.	2
c. National Institutes of Health, Multi-Level Parking Facilities	3
d. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building	3
3. <u>D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic</u>	
Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg Tunnel	3-4
4. <u>Department of the Interior, National Park Service</u>	
a. Ellipse Walks and Fountains	4
b. Douglass Community Center Bldg, 20th St. north of Stanton Terrace, S.E.	4
c. Columbia Island Landscaping	4
5. <u>D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections</u>	
American Institute of Architects Headquarters Bldg.	4-5
6. <u>Federal Reserve Board</u>	
Federal Reserve Board Building	5

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

The second session of the regular monthly meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts was held in the office of the Interior Building on 21 June 1967, at 9:30 a.m., with Chairman William Walton presiding.

Present were: William Walton
Gordon Bunshaft
Burnham Kelly
Theodore Roszak
Aline Saarinen
Hideo Sasaki
John Carl Warnecke

Staff: C.H. Atherton, Secretary
Donald Myer, Asst. Secretary
Nancee Black, Research Analyst
Myra Younker, Editor
NCPC: Pat Astore
Recorder: Leone Vialpando

II. ADMINISTRATION

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of 18-19 April 1967 meeting were approved.

2. Corcoran Gallery of Art (added)

The Commission had no objection to the Gallery's request to replace on a temporary basis the Rickey "3 Red Lines" sculpture on N.Y. Avenue with another sculpture by Barnett Newman or Mark de Suvero.

III. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Designs

Mr. Rannells and Mr. Harry Weese, architect for the stations, represented the Transportation Agency.

The Commission members tried to explore with Weese his basic approach to the design. As the discussion developed it became more apparent that the architect had missed the main criticism expressed at previous meetings. His studies still seemed to be probings in a variety of directions with no particular conviction evidenced in any one. A unified design could be achieved, in his opinion, through coordinating the many

details, e.g. signs, graphics, ticket booths, lighting, etc. The Commission, on the other hand, had repeatedly urged the entire system be developed as a unified whole.

Specifically rejected was the concept of determining station design on the basis of soil conditions, which appeared to be the architect's only rationale supporting the use of at least three different types of structural systems. These included columns and slab in cut and cover conditions, shallow vaults in solid stone boring areas, and high vaults in deep but unstable soil.

The Commission also rejected the use of natural stone and unfinished concrete as an interior material. It was this suggestion in particular that added so much to the overall impression of a rustic quaintness to Weese's approach - or "folk art" in the words of Mr. Bunshaft.

The need for a fresh imaginative contemporary solution was repeatedly stressed throughout the meeting. Although no formal vote of disapproval was taken, it was made quite clear to the architect that his studies to date were unacceptable.

The transcript of the meeting is submitted for the record. EXHIBIT A

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Leonard Hunter and Karel Yasko represented the General Services Administration.

a. F.B.I. Building - Revised Design

Mr. Gladwych, architect, presented the project. Mr. Bunshaft stated the Commission's view: that the ground floor exterior wall must be recessed to the rear face of the columns; the second floor-slab edge-beam must be turned down; and that the railing enclosing the second floor deck be fairly heavy looking. The architect agreed this was a reasonable solution.

b. National Zoological Park, Multi-Climate Building

Mr. Alan Jacobs, architect, presented the project.

Expressing the Commission's approval, Mrs. Saarinen congratulated the architect on his plan which provided a strong focal point to this particular area of the Zoo, without becoming obtrusive. This was due largely to setting the building within an existing natural hillside, and therefore accentuating the landscape rather than the architecture.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to GSA.

EXHIBIT B

c. National Institutes of Health, Multi-level Parking Facilities

Mr. Carroll, architect, attended the meeting for Smith, Henchman & Grylls. No representative appeared for Nottingham and Associates.

Dean Kelly expressed the Commission's view that the proposed structures, relatively simple and yet quite appropriate, should be screened with more trees. This action applied to both designs.

The Commission's approval was forwarded to NIH.

EXHIBIT C

d. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building - Proposed Design

Dr. Cornett of the College and Mr. Samperton, architect, attended the meeting.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Warnecke stated that it was impossible to evaluate this specific building without more background information. Future programs for the College should be made known so that the Commission will be able to evaluate this specific building in relationship to existing and future structures. A model of the master plan showing contours, roads, current and future buildings should be submitted with photographs of the existing campus. The Commission didn't particularly admire this design of the dormitory either; and said so.

The Commission's recommendations were forwarded to GSA.

EXHIBIT D

3. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg Tunnel

Mr. Sawyer of the Department and Mr. Reese, architect, attended the meeting.

Speaking for the Commission, Mr. Sasaki stated: (1) the free standing ventilator shafts were conspicuous; (2) the tunnel entrance too near the Lincoln Memorial; (3) the balustrade of the entrance too complicated which called attention to the tunnel; and (4) the loss of trees next to the reflecting pool unacceptable.

He and the other members stressed that the trees are an essential part of the composition of the reflecting pool and Lincoln Memorial and some way must be found to preserve them during construction. It was pointed out that at least 50 years was required to attain that growth.

The members suggested that the possibility of a single ventilating

tower be studied. A sculptural mass, low and horizontal in feeling in a location near the Tidal Basin was suggested.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the Department of Highways and Traffic.

EXHIBIT E

4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

a. Ellipse Walks and Fountains. Cancelled.

b. Douglass Community Center Building, 20th Street north of Stanton Terrace, S.E.

Mr. Horn and Mr. Roth of the National Park Service and Mr. Cross, architect, attended the meeting.

Mrs. Saarinen spoke for the Commission. The members felt the design was much too complicated and lacked the logic, and simplicity, essential to a small building of this type. The problem should be restudied. The program calls for a simple, strong statement.

The Commission's disapproval was forwarded to the National Park Service.

EXHIBIT F

c. Columbia Island Landscaping

Mr. Horn and Mr. Edward D. Stone, Jr., landscape architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Sasaki expressed the Commission's views by stating that the plans in general were acceptable but that he would like to review the details when further developed. He commented on the size of the fountain, suggesting that the water be more massive in form rather than small, slender jets.

The Commission's action was forwarded to the National Park Service.

EXHIBIT G

5. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building - Revised Design

Mr. Mills of the Institute and Mr. Giurgola, architect, attended the meeting.

Expressing the Commission's views, Mr. Bunshaft stated that the design is out of scale with the Octagon House and its garden, and inappropriate for the site. The existing AIA Headquarters Building was harmonious to the House and garden. These three features should be

retained as one complex. An alternative to this difficult problem might be to build the new office building where the adjacent Lemon building is or renovate that building for this purpose.

The Commission did not disagree with Mr. Giurgola's principle that a tall, modern building gives a certain scale to an environment but the members did disagree with the application of this principle to this site. Besides the matter of scale, the design was also thought to be entirely too manneristic and theatrical in character.

The Commission's disapproval was reported to the Department of Licenses and Inspections.

EXHIBIT H

6. Federal Reserve Board

Federal Reserve Board Building, C Street between 20th and 21st Streets, N.W.

Governor Shepardson of the Federal Reserve Board and Mr. Larson, architect, attended the meeting.

Mr. Bunshaft stated that the Commission approved the additional floor, the terraced top floor and the thickness of the fascia, but disapproved the roof penthouse. Another location within the building, preferably in the basement, would have to be found for the mechanical equipment. He and the members discussed various possible solutions to this problem. The architect appeared to be very reluctant to study other solutions.

The Commission's disapproval of this feature was forwarded to the Federal Reserve Board.

EXHIBIT I

The meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "C. H. Atherton", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Charles H. Atherton
Secretary

Have you any other little items?

MR. ATHERTON: No, we're all set to go. The subway people are in. Reynolds would like to come and sit in and listen as a representative of the agency and also one man from Weese's office.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: If no one objects, we'll have him in with Reynolds.

- - -

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Transportation Agency Subway Designs

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Good morning, Harry.

We thought the most useful thing at this moment is a simple bull session on the problems, philosophies and everything else of your great project, and we have all done our homework and read our submissions and looked over the material yesterday. We thought our two architect members would lead off discussing the problems, and you answer back, and it is totally informal, a legal session but not public. We have so many thoughts and ideas about the project at this stage that you know the approval or disapproval of the specific design is hardly the crux.

MR. WEESE: Shall I just listen?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it will just be conversation. Let's ask one of you to begin. Mr. Warnecke.

MR. WARNECKE: Mr. Chairman, I regret I didn't do my home work last night.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right, we'll pass you.

Mr. Bunshaft.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Harry, are you happy with what you are doing?

(Laughter).

MR. BUNSHAFT: What I'm getting at is this: this is a really serious thing to do, an underground transportation system in Washington, the capital, in a country that is getting highly subsidized. It's a marvellous opportunity to do something significant, and there are clients who may not sometimes appreciate that significance, I'm assuming. That's why I ask the question, are you happy?

MR. WEESE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Or are there restrictions?

MR. BUNSHAFT: Or are there restrictions? In fact, I think a subway like this should have the most basic questioning of what the hell this transportation system is, and what it's supposed to do. For example, we just assume that subways have to have advertising in them. That seems to be, you know, everybody takes it for granted. I don't. I question that whole

CHAIRMAN WHITON: Well, it will be in the

floor. Let's see one of you to bring Mr. Whiton.

MR. WHITON: Yes, Chairman, I suggest I bring Mr. Whiton.

Now with last night.

CHAIRMAN WHITON: All right, well I want you

Mr. Boardman.

MR. BOARDMAN: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to

be doing.

(Laughter)

MR. BOARDMAN: When I'm sitting in the chair, I

really serious thing to do, and I understand transportation

system in Washington, and I think it is a very

highly complicated. It's a very complicated opportunity to do some

thing significant, and there are a lot of things that are not

appreciated that significance. I'm assuming that's why I am

not questioning, are you happy?

MR. WHITON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WHITON: Oh, is there anything?

MR. BOARDMAN: I think there's something to be

think a number of things should have the most basic question

is of what the hell this transportation system is, and what

it's supposed to do. Not only that, but I think that's what

have to have established in the first place. I think that's what

everybody takes it for granted. I don't. I mean, I think that's what

premise. It's just like saying a federal highway should have billboards all along because it makes money, and I don't give a damn what Montreal or anybody else has done, this is a unique opportunity to build a transportation system or would represent transportation in this area for the next -- it's a unique opportunity, and when I use the advertising, that's one device to wonder about. I personally think there shouldn't be any. If you want to make money, you can make money all sorts of ways from brothels up and why should we assume that in transportation, underground, it has to be billboards just because somebody else has done it? These federal highways must -- nobody has come up with a device of putting out billboards because somehow everybody thinks that would be bad; still, the whole premise of all these things was based on billboards underground. That's one.

That's why I brought up, are you happy? I think an architect can be bossed to a point where we're not interested in Fine Arts -- I'm not; I think this thing ought to be the greatest thing, and it doesn't mean building what they did in Russia but there must be something in between Russia and a horizontal advertising device, and I don't think that anything like what I'm talking about is happening on the Washington subway system. I'm not talking about architectural detail. In fact, I think myself, just talking, the whole damn thing is concrete.

That's very nice and in vogue right now -- concrete; but I wonder if that's the right spirit? I don't know the answer. I'm no genius. If I were, I'd also be doing the job.

Is that the right answer, to make it a concrete thing throughout? It may be for budgets or something somebody said, but isn't this whole thing -- again I speak from great ignorance-- but isn't this whole subway partially subsidized by the federal government anyhow, and I don't know how this partial finance and partial sound investment business of advertising and all that, whether that's right for the City of Washington.

That comes back to my question, are you happy or are you doing the best you can within the engineers and also the engineers doing subways tend to do subways like the last subways they did. They're sound economically but not necessarily inventive. Perhaps you ought to have an outside consulting engineer, a brilliant guy who doesn't know anything about subways but knows about structure and things that might lead to some new forms. I don't know.

What we've been bulling about, not to sit and criticize you, but to get it into the broader aspects, to get a total concept. We feel this is bits and pieces, or I do, and not thought as a total. I'm through.

Well -- you haven't answered me, Harry. Are you happy? Or are you doing the best you can within the limitations that have been set?

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

I'm not sure if you're right or not.

But I think it's a good idea.

MR. WEESE: I feel that the limitations are valid and we have been fighting limitations all year.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Including advertising?

MR. WEESE: The advertising, you raise an interesting and debatable point. I think this dialogue could go on quite a while as to the use of advertising, whether it is an ornament to the thing and takes the place of a lot of applied art and gives some life and activity, and so on.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You think you like advertising? Would it enhance your living room?

MR. WEESE: I have a feeling about advertising and don't defend it to the end. It certainly is not needed outdoors and along the public highway. It's an unnecessary distraction, but in an interior environment, as long and broad as this, there has to be something to engage your attention more than just the people that might be there. I look on it as a kind of stained glass pop art changing scene that would by skillful manipulation of the advertisers and very stringent limitation on the amount of it, so the quality is always high --

MR. BUNSHAFT: What country are you in? Where is this quality advertising you are talking about? Who is going to do that?

MR. WEESE: Well, there have been some studies made

by various subway systems, the most current one the Barr system by Alexander Associates. They're very tough advertiser and limit the amount of use of it. I can't say that we are dependent on the use of advertising for design. It's an accessory, I would say. So I wouldn't like to have that be a turning point in our discussion today.

Could we just say that is one thing?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I don't think that Gordon means it to be the turning point. It's one of the elements that are under question.

MR. BUNSHAFT: No, I don't.

The materials could be beautiful, lighting could be beautiful, and the background for the people could be very exciting instead of assuming that you have to have stuff to make the space and the services exciting by having advertising.

MR. WEESE: All right, put it that way. It has to stand on its own without the advertising, exactly.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I am getting to the basic concept back of what a subway should be, somewhere between a palace and a concrete shelter.

MR. WEESE: To get back to your original question, which I would like to answer after I explain the reasons why I think we've got hold of this thing. The various inputs that go into this are a lot of social planning and a lot of

... but no issues of any of value

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

[illegible]

straight engineering questions, questions of simple geometry of traffic. It's a very big intricate system of things.

Now I accept everything that you say but this is terribly important, and it should not be cut down to any preconception budget, and we have nobody saying how much these stations should cost. The engineers never said there is a limit on how much a station costs. They have simply costed what we presented to them, so if we're undercutting what is possible, it is our doing; it's not anybody else's. Everybody knows there is an ultimate budget, but also everybody knows there are enough shifts in the system so this will have to be revised, anyway.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The stations must be a small cost out of the total system.

MR. WEESE: They are; on the other hand, if you look at the Berkeley station in Barr, which costs some \$9 million and examining the double layer design with all the multiple entrances, we see there the introduction of a lot of non-essential facility. Who needs that second layer and the second layer simply means you have two half-spaces instead of one whole. Our whole thrust has been to maximize the volume. We'd love to go as high as a long room like this ought to be, and it's higher than we would go because we'd obviously push the whole line down and it would then become a value judgment, instead of

of the... I'm a very big... of the...

Now I agree... you are...

...and it seems...

...and we have...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

...the...

how you spend the money. There's a delicate balance between constructing everything that is possible within reason and doing something that is simply arbitrary.

We have chosen concrete as the basic material because there is so much of it, and we felt it could be the background material, whether bush-hammered or metal form or whatever, and that the foreground material, so to speak, would be the bronze and granite. These are things that take the gaff and things that should look permanent forever and if we go that far that everything is bronze and granite and only the surroundings are concrete washed with light, not needing advertising, then I think we're telling the structural truth about the thing, not having veneers. We adopted hopefully the idea we don't have to hang any finishes in there. The original "blue book", so-called, treated the architectural part as the finish you put in later, and even broke concrete down into layers and finished it and two years later, an architect comes along and decorates the station. We felt if we helped to shape the structure -- it may seem more complex, more involved, more varied than it should, but we are convinced unless we can learn something otherwise, that these variations are inevitable and our whole thrust is to try to limit them to the least amount.

The next station we bring in to you, presumably next month, will be a transfer station which is a totally different animal, you know, where one station is above the other, and the

lower station becomes double height for the station, has floating layers of traffic going down in escalators, becomes spatially much more involved.

But we would hope none of this complex is for its own sake and everything is the least. "Less is more."

MRS. SAARINEN: May I ask a question, since I am not an architectural member?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Go ahead.

MRS. SAARINEN: Supposing, Harry, nobody had ever built a subway before, and you were having to examine what a subway means. Would your thought be that the environment you wish to provide was something that sort of took your mind off the fact you were going in a subway and created a sort of homey, folksy experience? Or would you want to celebrate this astounding phenomenon of technology in which you can travel underground at fairly rapid speed, because I think that's sort of what we have to get back to here. I think for me it's a kind of conflict here between a business which is sort of voguish at the moment, to make everybody feel, you know, experienced on a human scale, human level, a kind of cottage-like experience, and maybe this is Washington, which we must not forget, but even aside from that, has anybody taken the concept of a subway, when the first subways were built in 1901 or around then in the 1900s -- the idea was to make palaces and

to forget, you know, and I think maybe what we are sort of questioning is -- we know you have traveled around the world underground and saw so many things, but suppose you faced freshly, how would you feel?

MR. WEESE: The way to face it freshly would be to say, "Build a new city of a million people, and the first thing you do is put in a subway net and around that build the city, and how would you do it?" I think that would be the one in terms of what the environment would be.

Well, obviously, if you're going to build from that kind of scratch, you put the system directly underground, as near the street as possible, as near as your layering of mezzanines allow you, and you would do it all of a piece and have it like a utility, but a beautiful utility in the sense that all the things we see as we walk through the outdoor environment which this is an extension of, should be beautiful.

MRS. SAARINEN: Well, is it an extension of the outdoor environment? You see that is maybe where I was trying to get back to your concept. Is it extension of outdoor environment?

MR. WEESE: Well, consider the people on the train. Most of them are getting on in the open; in the first line, most or a lot of stations are in the open, so you're on an open platform and it's like commuting, you get on a car. You go underground only when the city becomes that dense.

In 1967, you know, and I think that was the last time

questioning is -- we have been questioning and we have

understanding and we are not in a position to understand

how much we have

DR. WEBER: Now we are in a position to understand

and we are in a position to understand the way in which

you are in a position to understand the way in which

and how much we have

or what the environment really is.

Well, originally, it was the going to be a kind of

kind of action, you have the system directly understood, we

have the effect in practice, and we are in a position to

understand the way in which we are in a position to

have in this a reality, but a possibility of action in the world

that all the things we are in the world, we are in the world

environment which is an extension of the world in which we

DR. WEBER: Well, is it an extension of the world

and environment? You are that a world which I am going

to get back to later tonight. Is it an extension of the world

environment?

DR. WEBER: Well, certainly the world is the world

that we are in the world and it is the world in the world

that we are in the world and it is the world in the world

that we are in the world and it is the world in the world

You could say, well, you could arrive in a room but is it proper to bring trains into --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You're wearing outdoors clothes; there's no question of that. Nobody gets on the subway and takes off his coat and hangs it up.

MRS. SAARINEN: Right. But is it its own environment or an extension of the outdoor?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, it's a peculiar --

MRS. SAARINEN: It is its own environment, really.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mixed environment.

MRS. SAARINEN: That's the point I'm trying to sort of get at, or the question --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what Aline is trying to say, first, take this concrete alone, that's an exterior material, you know, generally. Structural material. These are interior enclosed spaces. My impression is that you are trying to get the outdoors to get in there, trying to have the outdoors felt indoors. You know -- openness going into the thing and all that. I question all that. I think in about 30 or 50 years, people will be doing what the very rich do: own topcoats and go from their airconditioned house to airconditioned car to airconditioned party, which is standard now in Texas where it's hot.

MRS. SAARINEN: And in New York from steamheated apartment to heated car.

You would say, well, you could have it in 1900.

and is it proper to write history this -

CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

There's no question of that. Nobody can't do it because you

know you can't do it in 1900.

MR. CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

There's no question of that. Nobody can't do it because you

know you can't do it in 1900.

MR. CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

MR. CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

of that at the question -

MR. CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

First, there's a question of time. I think it is proper to write history this way.

You know, generally, historical material. I think it is proper to write history this way.

Secondly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

Thirdly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

Fourthly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

Fifthly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

Sixthly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

Seventhly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

Eighthly, I think it is proper to write history this way.

It's done.

MR. CHURCHMAN: I think it is proper to write history this way.

Apartment to be used as a

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, whatever you want to call it but this concrete which is a cure-all for all architecture because it's so honest and I've been a party to it, I just wonder how beautiful these subways will be in ten years when the concrete is crazed, cracked, and when you think of the maintenance standards of one of these agencies? Now, just for illustration, and I'm not proposing this, if you stuff this place in marble, it would be maintained better than if it were concrete because there are certain things people have to clean, whether they like it or not. I'm not proposing marble, but I'm illustrating this; and you are building a place where concrete is still concrete. It's going to get kind of gloomy, it's gray, and you are depending -- design-wise, it's very nice, rough texture, neutral gray contrasted with lots of gaiety, graphics and displacement. You depend on that to make it beautiful, and lighting. Well, that's an outdoor concept underground.

You could design this whole thing like a piece of machinery. I'm not advocating it, but you could take an entirely different approach. It could be designed like the train. You could start with the piece of machinery, the train, and take that right through and the whole thing would be a piece of machinery. I am not advocating that, but I am just illustrating there are other approaches, and it could be a sense when you're in there, you're inside something that is a transportation subway. For example, an airplane -- the

MR. BUCHHEIT: Well, now that we have a...

my first impression was that it was a very good...

because it is the same as the one I saw in...

which was beautiful. Every day will be in the...

the results are the best. I am sure that...

the results are the best. I am sure that...

for illustration, and I am sure that...

that is the best. I am sure that...

it was a very good one. I am sure that...

that is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

of course, it is very good. I am sure that...

it is very good. I am sure that...

that is the best. I am sure that...

to see it. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

that is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

which is the best. I am sure that...

outside of an airplane is fabulous, but when you get inside and they try to make it like a tavern or night club -- if somebody ever did an airplane interior sort of shipshape, it would probably be marvellous experience. Frank Stanton's plane is the closest I've seen to a plan; it has seats, white walls, and technical equipment. I mean we're not proposing any solution but we really think there ought to be some -- I don't know -- some of us think this is a little folksy.

MR. WEESE: I'd rather hear you say "rough" than "folksy," I think.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I won't say "rough." We just wondered if somebody should be folksy, the details, character. This is a formal monumental city, at least the center part.

MR. WEESE: But did you see the diagram of the line? The line is a piece of spaghetti, it's up and down under utilities.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's only the tube doing it, and in fact if you think of the subway as a tube, which the London subway is, the things are shaped like a hole, and if it's a piece of spaghetti, that's what one expects spaghetti to do: go up and down.

MR. WEESE: When people come in there in their overcoats, all wet, maybe even tracking in snow on their feet, they can mess up that environment awfully fast. Would you rather

number of an airplane is recorded, and when you see a plane

and they try to make it like a record of what's going on --

anybody ever did an airplane layout sort of airplane? It was

probably an airplane layout. I mean, I mean, I mean, I mean, I mean

the closest I've seen to a plane, it was a plane, which was

and technical equipment. I mean, I mean, I mean, I mean, I mean

equipment but we really think there's a plane -- I

don't know -- some of us think this is a plane, I mean.

MR. WESS: I'd rather have you say "plane" than

"airplane," I think.

MR. WESS: I would say "plane." We just

numbered it somebody should be taking, and I mean, I mean, I mean

This is a formal monument, it's a plane, and I mean, I mean

MR. WESS: But did you see the diagram of the plane

The line is a plane of equipment, it's a plane and I mean

utilized.

MR. WESS: That's only the first part of it, and

to that if you think of the plane as a road, which is

London runway is the plane and I mean, I mean, I mean

it's a plane of equipment, that's what you mean, I mean

to do, go on and on.

MR. WESS: When people come to know in their

overcome, all well, maybe even speaking in how on earth they

they can make up that environment, which is, I mean, I mean

see people walking over slightly rougher environment, messing it up, than to crack up the front room, so to speak?

MR. KELLY: This is the building lobby problem.

MR. WEESE: Yes. I don't think of it as a building lobby or even a building. I think of it as unique to itself.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think you might have a system of floor materials of nothing we're talking about. Just to be silly, the big surfaces of the Rome airport have some sort of rubber thing there. It could be something besides concrete. That's just a sidewalk.

MR. WEESE: We don't have concrete under foot.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's what you said, granite for a while, and go to a grid pattern in concrete.

MR. WEESE: No, that's beyond the right-of-way line.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What do you have for paving?

MR. WEESE: Granite at the top around the surface cut. We go down the escalator which is all metal, of course, and the minute you hit the mezzanine, you're on a tile, not like Nicholson's restaurant, a special tile, and you go down the platform.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What is the whole platform made of?

MR. WEESE: Of this quarry tile scored for non-slip and it makes you feel it through your feet.

MR. BUNSHAFT: What color?

MR. WEESE: A stone gray, warm color, and the granite edge of the platform. In other words, everything that you walk on and touch is the finest, but the stuff you look at from a distance or cannot touch we feel could be structured, just the structure itself.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I don't think of this tile, just a gray old thing, as the finest.

MR. WEESE: Well, we could have grainite which crossed our mind, too.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Granite looks like concrete, too, you know.

MR. WEESE: We wanted the hard durable long-wearing quarry tile with ridges. I think you put your finger on the question, and it's so basic, I think.

MR. BUNSHAFT: We are just raising these for you to think about, is all I think.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: I take it there are three different situations basically. One might be illustrated here (indicating), where you are under a deep rock cut, and what you call open-trench cut you built, and one completely in the air, so this is the other one (indicating on drawing). Now the other time you were here on this station, I take it, which is Dupont Circle, you had it in this false perspective kind of thing with a notch.

MR. WHEELER: I am sorry, with respect to the

franchise side of the business. In other words, we are not going to
you will be in the line of the franchise, but the fact is that
of the franchise or business, which we feel would be a disadvantage
that the situation is such.

MR. BUSHNELL: I don't think we are going to have

a very old thing, as the franchise.

MR. WHEELER: Well, as you have indicated, when

opened our mind, too.

MR. BUSHNELL: That is the way the franchise, too.

Yes, sir.

MR. WHEELER: We wanted the kind of thing you wanted

quarter mile with respect. I think you had your finger on the

question, and it is a matter, I think.

MR. BUSHNELL: We are now raising these for you

to think about, as all I think.

STANLEY WATSON: M. B. B. B.

MR. BUSHNELL: I am sure there are some differences

institutions especially, and I am sure we are interested here (in the

line) where you are now, a deep race out, and what you will

open-franchise and you will, and are completely in the line

as this is the great one (indicating on drawing). Now you

over time you were not in the line, I am sure.

which is the same thing you had in the line, as you have

kind of thing with a better.

MR. WEESE: We left that home.

MR. SASAKI: Now, have you abandoned this idea because you said you were not putting an applique or finish but you're putting a surface so the surface could be vaulted or flat?

MR. WEESE: Right.

MR. SASAKI: It could be any shape.

MR. WEESE: Okay.

MR. SASAKI: Since you have gotten rid of the taper, it could consistently be of one art.

MR. WEESE: The taper is, say, on the back burner. It may turn into a double taper in some cases or might disappear.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'll put it this way: if we don't disappear, it will disappear.

(Laughter)

MR. SASAKI: These three conditions, as I interpret Harry's presentation, in the so-called open trench cut he just simply puts a beam across there, and that's the concrete beam for which you developed the lighting fixture, this pre-cast concrete beam across there?

MR. WEESE: Always eight feet.

MR. SASAKI: Now, then, in the open-air one, you have built out a cantilevered arm to protect the train, as well as the people, and this is the kind of created passageway.

MR. WHEELER: Yes, that's correct.

MR. WHEELER: Now, would you please state that?

Because you said you were not going to say anything about the
fact that you were writing a letter to the Attorney General concerning

of that

MR. WHEELER: That's correct.

MR. WHEELER: It would be very good.

MR. WHEELER: Okay.

MR. WHEELER: Would you please write that on the paper

it could consist of one or two.

MR. WHEELER: The paper is, yes, on the top of the paper.

It may turn into a double paper in some cases, but I think this

appears.

MR. WHEELER: I'll put it in this way; if we don't

disappear, it will disappear.

(Laughter)

MR. WHEELER: There are two conditions, I think.

Harry's presentation, in the so-called other words, that is

that simply puts a few words there, and that's the condition.

Now, for which you developed the hearing, which is, that you

will not have any more of that.

MR. WHEELER: Always right, that's

MR. WHEELER: Now, when, in the other way, that is

will not be continued and in respect to that, as well as

the people, and this is the kind of a hearing that

MR. WEESE: That is arched.

MR. SASAKI: Open arch. This is the station platform.
This is not closed, is it?

MR. WEESE: Well, there is a skylight.

MR. SASAKI: But I mean the sides are all open?

MR. WEESE: Oh, yes, it's open air.

MR. BUNSHAFT: So you eventually go into a round
subway?

MR. WEESE: That's it. Gives some height, you see.
You bring the roof right down over the train, so you don't
get too much wind and rain. You have to relieve it.

MR. SASAKI: What you're trying here is to get as close
an expression of the particular structural system or structural
or engineering situation, the problem you are faced up with,
and that creates three distinct things. That's at least the
philosophical or design point of view. We may disagree with
it -- with height, shape, finish of the vault or whatever, but
you can do it this way and get three unique ones, or you could
get a consistent one which could be flat, too. You can go
toward uniqueness, individual expression, or kind of uniformity.

Now the detailing follows consistently thereafter,
so you can either cover this up as you have done in this
situation here (indicating) or you can expose it, so you cover it
in one instance and expose it in the other. Then in the side one,

MR. WHELAN: That is correct.

MR. WHELAN: Open again. That is the entire situation.

This is not closed, is it?

MR. WHELAN: Well, there is a question.

MR. WHELAN: I mean the right to the right.

MR. WHELAN: Oh, yes, it's open.

MR. WHELAN: Do you want to see a picture?

Why?

MR. WHELAN: Well, it's a picture of the right.

You bring the roof right down over the right, so you don't

get too much wind and rain. You have to be careful.

MR. WHELAN: Well, you're trying to get to the right.

an expression of the particular structural system or arrangement

of engineering situation, the problem has to be solved up with

and that creates three distinct things. There is the form and

philosophical or design point of view. We are dealing with

it -- with height, depth, finish of the walls or whatever, but

you can do it this way and you have a different one, or you could

have a consistent one which could be 100, 100. You can do

toward uniqueness, individual expression, or kind of uniformity.

Now the building follows consistently character.

so you can either carry this up or you move down in this

situation here (indication) or you can change it. or you can

in one instance and expose it in the other. Then in the other

174
you have these columns occurring, 16 feet on center, or something like that, and they're sort of canted, which gives you this situation here where the billboards can occur, so you have some sort of scaling device.

As I take it, you say this (indicating) is smooth, and the floor warps up and you have a rail that goes up, is that right?

MR. WEESE: Sort of.

MR. SASAKI: Sort of, so it's sort of like the tunnel that Eero did for the TWA in New York.

So anyway, I think the thing that I find --

MR. BUNSHAFT: What's wrong with Eero's tunnel? What happens if you have one material running all around the thing?

MRS. SAARINEN: Let Sasaki finish.

MR. SASAKI: The question I have of Harry is what I think maybe the drawings are --

MR. WEESE: Folksy.

MR. SASAKI: Maybe they are deceptive; maybe there is more hardheaded thought to this thing.

MR. BUNSHAFT: You are being very kind.

MR. SASAKI: And then your mezzanine, the plan shape too seems to express this, like the mezzanine is like the TWA terminal, and flows; and yet in other areas, it is rather geometric.

you have those so many different, if you are looking for
things like that, and then you sort of... when you are
in that situation you have the different...
have some sort of feeling device.

As I take it, you say this (hesitating) is correct
and the other way is not correct - that's what you
is that right?

MR. WATSON: Yes, sir.
MR. WATSON: But of course, sort of like the same
thing, but did you say that in New York.

So anyway, I think the thing that I find --
MR. WATSON: That's what you say, isn't it?
What happens in your case and what happens in yours
the thing?

MR. WATSON: That's what I find.
MR. WATSON: The question I have of that is what
I think means the thing, isn't it?

MR. WATSON: Right.
MR. WATSON: Now, you are generally saying there
is some difference between the two things.

MR. WATSON: You are saying very kind.
MR. WATSON: And then you are saying, the thing
always goes along for... like the... is the
the... and then you are saying, the thing
isn't... is that right?

Now, this station here (indicating) you have angles like this and in others you deliberately, with an angular material, turn or soften the corner, so anyway, I get lost about then -- whether we just follow consistently in this silhouette in here, maybe in here because this also being of concrete, could be that, so there could be uniformity. I ask this, should there be one sort of design theme, if you will? You know the TWA terminal certainly has that. Others develop quite a different sort of format.

I think what I find a little confusing is these kinds of things (indicating). Now these are terribly personal and you can say at this point, I think, well, you have not really studied these but at sometime or other, it seems to me we have to have a complete pattern. I mean that is reasonable to ask.

MR. WEESE: Oh, it is. May I respond to that?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. Yes, to everything, if you will.

MR. WEESE: The sketches, because I did them, are all personal. We could turn them into a much more objective hardboiled thing, and I think it would look different. I agree that there are seeming inconsistencies in that we have both square corners and curves, but let us say that this is the structure here (indicating). We could put in a flat ceiling but would be throwing away all that volume.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I interrupt?

MR. WEESE: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: There are two technical things: one is lighting. The whole problem of lighting. You are doing it with standards thrown up. Am I wrong or right?

MR. WEESE: The lighting is indirect from here on the ceiling and from behind the platform up on the wall with accent lighting --

MR. BUNSHAFT: Aren't there mechanical things, too? Ventilation?

MR. WEESE: Yes, there is a system. The engineers are now studying air conditioning the entire tunnel network system. This is just in the study stage.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I was just wondering. What you are really doing is in some cases just digging a trench and in some cases digging a form of tunnel through the earth.

MR. WEESE: Yes.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The form could be a product and maybe research on lighting, mechanical, as well as people, and all that.

MR. WEESE: Well, it's all invisible, under the platform.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm talking about the problem of lighting. I don't think putting up a standard is necessarily the most brilliant solution. These things I am saying might

MR. BUSHAW: Now I understand.

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MR. BUSHAW: There are two separate things:

one is lighting. The whole problem is lighting. You are

going to have a considerable amount of light, and I want to know

MR. WEBER: The lighting is important from here on in.

ceiling and from behind the platform up on the wall with

even lighting.

MR. BUSHAW: That's some technical things, too.

Technical?

MR. WEBER: Yes, there is a system. The engineers

are now studying air conditioning the entire tunnel network

system. This is just at the study stage.

MR. BUSHAW: Well, I was just wondering. What you

are really doing is in some cases just digging a trench

and in some cases digging a form of tunnel. Between the two

MR. WEBER: Yes.

MR. BUSHAW: The two could be a product and

major reason for lighting, mechanically, as well as people, but

all that.

MR. WEBER: Well, it's all technical, under the

platform.

MR. BUSHAW: I'm asking about the problem of

lighting. I don't think digging up a tunnel is necessarily

the most brilliant solution. There's a lot of things I'm asking about.

lead to some form for this hall where you take the train and would be interesting. I agree with you it's a shame to throw the space away but is it necessary to expose all this so-called structure? I don't know how beautiful it's going to be.

MR. WEESE: Well, let me say the technical advances of this are great because we get acoustic material back in there where it does not show and won't have to bother anybody, and we get plenty of reflectivity back here.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I understand all that, Harry, but you also get, as Sasaki pointed out, quite a variety.

MR. WEESE: The way to avoid variety, there are two ways: one is to make everything the arch, which is just a natural form. This means that we would never be able to make one room out of it because at the end, where the mezzanine is, you have to break up into another space. This means you're up here looking down into a kind of hole, and then don't see through; and we think the minute you enter this space, you ought to be part of the whole thing, not only for surveillance but for claustrophobia.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Yes, I understand.

MR. WEESE: So the only thing is if we make them all flat, we'd be throwing away the volume that is naturally there, so it is a dilemma. I think there is a place where you have to relent.

MR. SASAKI: I think what we want is a conscious

lead to some thing, the same will be true in the future.
would be interesting, I agree with you that it is
the space was but in its relation to the whole it was an

of the same order. I don't know how to put it, but it is

MR. WILSON: Well, let me say the general impression

this was given, namely that the general impression was in fact

more or less the same, but that there was a certain amount of

we had heard in the past, but not in the present.

MR. WILSON: I understand all that, but, but the

also, the general impression was in fact

MR. WILSON: The same is true in fact, but not in

fact: that is to say, everything was done, which is not

entirely true. This means that we would have to find the

one from out of it, and that is the end, which the speaker

is, you know to know up to the point of the speaker's

up to the point of the speaker's, and then the speaker

there, and we think the speaker is in the same

ought to be paid in the same way, but with the speaker

was the speaker's

MR. WILSON: Yes, I understand

MR. WILSON: So the only thing is to see how

all this, he's in the same way, and then the speaker

there, so it is a question, I think there is a question

have to be made

MR. WILSON: I think there is a question

choice. I think there can be a legitimate difference in the point of view on choice.

MRS. SAARINEN: Yes.

MR. SASAKI: You say that your dilemma -- I think the design is a system of conscious choice. It's not accidental or entirely a pragmatic sort of thing. This therefore follows, you know, because you can make conscious choices along the way and as long as we understand the conscious choice, I think we can appreciate what you are getting at.

MR. WEESE: Well, it's not a dilemma to me. I say it's a dilemma in this discussion -- you see, this thing has been evolving for more than a year now, and your comments last time reinforced and in fact changed the direction when you said continuity and control and consistency above all, and this I think helped the clients to understand and ourselves, as well; and at the same time, we can't say that it ought to be rigidized with modules and all these things that ignore the realities.

MR. SASAKI: The nature of the problem.

MR. WEESE: The nature of the problem. I thought, for instance, you would ask about the underpinning in Judiciary Square which is the one station we're anxious to get --

MRS. SAARINEN: I think what we've been questioning is not details of things as much as these basic concepts, these things of variety, the business of the structure, the

1992: 1992, 2001, 2002, 2003

materials; and really the spirit of the place. I mean, do you want to come in particularly in Washington, maybe to something which suggests a rather dignified permanent lasting place with some nice materials and the kind of finish and elegance, maybe, you know, that sort of carries on the spirit of the federal city as the federal city, what they tried to do in Dulles, for instance, or do you want to get into something which I know you don't like the word, "folksy," but in a sense these are. This business -- oh, you know -- the indoor-outdoor experience and the lovely thing of walking and the kind of -- I don't know -- maybe this is the whole thing that you believe, that you believe it's more important to have a kind of experience than to just have a kind of dignified environment in which the excitement is in the roar, that sound of the train coming, and you're getting in and it is carrying you off, you see. I think you have tried to create little environments of place and they're different in spirit, and I think maybe that is as well, I mean they follow from the different structures, probably, but I think it is a question of whether it doesn't get a kind of confused and very kind of personal thing, instead of maybe a more impersonal just sense of dignity.

I mean the nicest way to go home is to have a limousine and drive which is the quietest, calmest way of travel.

...and the ... of the ...

...to ... in the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

...the ... of the ...

Now, this is a difference in spirit. Since you have to take the subway, you want to make it a sort of lively thing.

MR. WEESE: I don't think of it as very lively. Those buttresses along the wall make the wall much thinner and also break down the length. Six hundred feet is a fantastically long thing, as you know, and if it were all dignified, where does dignity become so boring that you feel like you're in a marble coffin?

MRS. SAARINEN: Maybe that's where you do.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Harry, I think rationale, you know, is a wonderful thing. If you had ten good architects, sincere like yourself, they could rationalize ten different designs, everything from a marble palace down to what you have and all could make a very sound explanation and the question is, just like, I guess -- the question is, should this subway end up -- well, I personally think -- if you have one budget to get concrete, natural things, if somebody said, "We don't want that. We want it really palatial," you probably would not enjoy doing it.

MR. WEESE: Oh, I could spend all the money there is.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, why the hell don't you try? You're doing this like the engineers are climbing all over you.

Now, there is a difference in spirit. There is
a sense of the thing, but when it is said to be
done.

MR. WHEELER: I don't think it is as simple.
There are many things that will make the well known
and also break down the barrier. Six months ago I
consequently found that, as you know, and it is more
difficult, where there is a high number of people, and you
live in a house in a house.

MR. WHEELER: There is a sense of the thing.
MR. WHEELER: There is a sense of the thing, and there
is a wonderful thing. I don't see how it is possible
to have the people, and the people are different
things, everything from a simple house to a house
and all could make a very good house, and the
question is, just like, I think -- the question is, how
can we get it -- well, I certainly think -- as you
one might to get together, and the thing is, how
"the don't want that. It is not a thing, it is a thing
would not enjoy doing it.

MR. WHEELER: No, I don't think it is the same thing.
MR. WHEELER: Well, the well known thing, and there
you're doing this like the people are doing it over

MR. WEESE: No, they're not.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, I say you are doing it like they are climbing all over you. I think you're climbing on yourself. Sasaki here kept using Eero's TWA. But take that, too; maybe there is a research in some material that could do everything and I was sort of trying to say maybe lighting, a hot rod lighting guy working with you might come up with a form. It isn't just a structural expression; it could be several expressions, structural integrated with lighting, also. All we are mumbling about is to try to get something exciting, not just a straightforward rock cut to get some sort of arch. But I think this is what you like. I think it's like asking Picasso to do a Mondrian.

MR. ROSZAK: He'd do it. He wouldn't hesitate.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That's what we're talking about.

MR. WARNECKE: It could be all aluminum, beautiful light, an indoor lobby. Now do you like that idea?

MR. WEESE: No, I detest it. We have more than our quota of lobbies.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Well, what's the alternative?
Grottoes?

MR. WEESE: In Spain you have wonderful -- it's a hot climate, and you don't want to agitate the environment too much, don't want to see too many joints. You have beautiful floors in Spain, you have very calm surroundings, usually white

MR. WEISS: No, don't say that.

MR. BUSHNETT: Well, I say that because I like

they are standing all over you. I think you are all right.

yourself. I think there is something wrong with you.

too, maybe there is a feeling in some way that would

be something and I was just as likely to say some thing

is not too high and working with me, but I was just as

low. It isn't just a feeling, it is a feeling.

several expressions, it is a feeling, it is a feeling.

yes. All we are doing about it is to try to get something

existing, not just a feeling, not just a feeling, not just a feeling.

of it. But I think that is what you like. I think it's

five years, please to do a something.

MR. ROSS: I'm not at all. I'm not at all.

MR. BUSHNETT: That's what you're saying about.

MR. BUSHNETT: It seems to me all right, it seems to me

right, an inner feeling. And do you like that about

MR. WEISS: No, I don't like it. I don't like it.

more or less.

MR. BUSHNETT: Well, what's the difference?

of course?

MR. WEISS: In Spain you have something. — I like

a hot climate, and you don't want to be there, but you want

too much, don't want to see you very much, you have something

about it. You don't want to be there, but you want

plaster and wonderful wrought iron, which could be kind of candelabra blazing with light.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Where is this white plaster? You haven't got the white here yet.

MR. WEESE: Maybe that is the issue or one very close to it, but by pouring light on this surface --

MR. BUNSHAFT: This is poured-in-place concrete?

MR. WEESE: Yes. We can't afford white cement. You know that. So we'd have to paint it if we were going to do anything like that.

MR. BUNSHAFT: That wall isn't holding anything, is it?

MR. WEESE: Oh, yes, the walls are working; all structure, no finish.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Sounds beautiful. I can see a subway contractor pouring this concrete. Holy God!

MR. WARNECKE: Isn't it going to get dirtier and dirtier and darker and darker?

MR. WEESE: We have fiberglass forms throughout. You blow it off.

CHAIRMAN WILTON: This is the fate of an open-end discussion. I give you all warning that in five minutes we are going to end it, no matter at what stage.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Fancy aggregate?

pleasant and wonderful weather. I hope you could find it

enjoyable. Please write soon.

MR. WILSON: There is still some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WILSON: I hope you are all well and happy.

Close to it, but no longer than the others.

MR. WILSON: There is some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

You know that, we would have to go to it we were going to

no stopping like that.

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

147

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WILSON: There will be some business, you

know, and the whole thing.

MR. WEESE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Ted.

MR. ROSZAK: You covered that illustration of the three basic ideas -- you covered them up.

MR. SASAKI: These are better illustrations (indicating).

MR. ROSZAK: I want to know, No. 1, 2, 3, now let's say 1, 2 and 3 constitutes 100 percent. Now where's the ratio between 1, 2 and 3?

MR. WEESE: We have about I'd say 25 percent more of this than that (indicating No. 1 and 2), and we have about in the first part of the system, about as many of the No. 3 as of the No. 2. So No. 1 is the predominant.

MR. ROSZAK: But that's not 100 percent.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: These are just rough figures.

MR. ROSZAK: I'm just curious to know how much of it is under ground.

MR. WEESE: Oh, nine miles in the first 25-mile system.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Once you get above ground you're really out of the heart of the city, and you're in the suburbs and that's different architecture in the neighborhood.

MR. WEESE: It's going to be the devil to control that, too.

MR. BUNSHAFT: The architecture is expressed above ground.

MR. WHEELER: Yes.

MR. WHEELER: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I have read the transcript.

THE COURT: All right, let's go on.

MR. WHEELER: That is correct, I have read the transcript.

MR. ROBERTS: I have read the transcript, and I have read the transcript.

THE COURT: All right, let's go on.

Between 11 and 12.

MR. WHEELER: Yes, I have read the transcript.

of that time last (approximately 11 and 12), and he says that

in the first part of the statement, he says that he was at the 11 and 12

is at the 11 and 12, and he says that he was at the 11 and 12.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I have read the transcript.

CHAIRMAN WHEELER: Yes, I have read the transcript.

MR. ROBERTS: I have read the transcript, and I have read the transcript.

in order to read.

MR. WHEELER: Yes, I have read the transcript.

THE COURT:

MR. WHEELER: Yes, I have read the transcript.

well, but at the same time, he says that he was at the 11 and 12.

and he says that he was at the 11 and 12, and he says that he was at the 11 and 12.

MR. WHEELER: Yes, I have read the transcript.

THE COURT:

MR. WHEELER: Yes, I have read the transcript.

THE COURT:

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: I come back to the point made last time here, I really worry about the open entrances in the downtown end. You're speaking about thousands of people by definition or you wouldn't be having a subway system. A lot of them would love to be protected by your beautiful system so they could get either to a cab or bus or indoors. I think at least in the downtown end, anything you could do to keep them covered --

MR. WEESE: We'd do it every chance we had which would not intrude onto the scene and turn it into sheep runs.

MR. WARNECKE: There's a lot to that. Let's not build a lot of houses all over every little molehill opening.

MR. KELLY: If you are going to walk a hundred yards anyway, you can walk 110 yards. There's lots of ladies carrying packages who don't agree with you on the outdoors and they're using the subway.

MR. WARNECKE: I think, Harry, it would be better to get really tough, hard drawings here of a structural system with hard lighting.

MR. WEESE: Depersonalizing.

MR. WARNECKE: Well, so we can see it. Now you're confusing everybody.

MRS. SAARINEN: Do you think some sort of engineer who might come up with some sort of totally new --

CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kelly.

MR. KELLY: I have only a few more questions.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the

document. You're talking about the fact that

definition of you wouldn't be having a steady stream.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the document.

Wouldn't it be possible for you to have a steady stream?

I think at least in the document and, I think you would be

in the same position.

MR. KELLY: Yes, I do. I do. I do. I do.

Wouldn't it be possible for you to have a steady stream?

MR. KELLY: Yes, I do. I do. I do. I do.

A lot of money and a lot of money. I think you would be

MR. KELLY: I am not going to wait a hundred years.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the document.

Wouldn't it be possible for you to have a steady stream?

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the document.

MR. KELLY: I am not going to wait a hundred years.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the document.

Wouldn't it be possible for you to have a steady stream?

MR. KELLY: I am not going to wait a hundred years.

MR. KELLY: I am not going to wait a hundred years.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the document.

MR. KELLY: I am not going to wait a hundred years.

Now, I would like to ask you a question in the document.

MR. WEESE: We've had several on our string along the way, testing, just for comparative purposes, and no one has come up with anything.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. This is certainly the idea in the back of all of our minds.

MR. WEESE: We've had Bill Lamb of Boston all along the way.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We were thinking of a marvellous new thing in engineering or lighting which would dictate the design that would be rather revolutionary and beautiful and we'd all be proud of. That's really the message we got.

MRS. SAARINEN: Also what Sasaki was saying about confusion of ideas. You have that baroque thing under the flap thing, you know.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Harry, I do think we're going to have to quit. We have a lot of people waiting. We deeply appreciate your patience.

MR. KELLY: Did you think the covering of the track system there would seem to invite people jumping on the track?

MR. WEESE: The clients have been with us all the way. I must say we've had our arguments, but they like the floating mezzanine which doesn't intrude on the volume.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Well, thank you very much.

(Mr. Weese and his party withdrew from the conference room.)

[illegible]

THE COMMISSIONER OF THE GENERAL LAND OFFICE

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I think whatever action we take we'll take now while it's fresh in our minds. Put up Judiciary Square if that's what he wants action on.

MRS. SAARINEN: By taking an action on Judiciary Square, we negate everything we have said in a way, because we asked him to think all through a whole problem, and then suddenly okaying a station, you're putting your stamp of approval on it.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: I am not proposing that we approve.

MRS. SAARINEN: I'm making this point, if we approve this we are discounting everything we've said, because we're doing it in a bits and pieces way.

MR. KELLY; I am prepared to accept the general cut that has to be made, the general treatment of walls. I think the detail --

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think he's asking for approval of this station, and if we approve this station we might as well forget the rest. I'll be no party to approving this. This is a serious problem here because this is going into this jury place depending on advertising to give color, and the lighting is about as ingenious as my underdrawers. Anybody can put up a stanchion, and he really doesn't want to solve the problem. The truth of the matter is, it's the wrong --

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Similarly, Gordon, we are going to

CHURCHMAN: I think we should consider the

we'll have now while it's fresh in our minds. But up

to the Board of Directors, I think we should consider the

MRS. GARDNER: Of course we should consider the

opinion, we have everything we have said in a way, because

we have to think all through a whole problem, and

then suddenly we're saying a decision. You're making your

it approved on it.

CHURCHMAN: I'm not proposing that we approve

MRS. GARDNER: I'm asking this point, if we approve

we're approving everything we've said, because we're doing it

in a different way.

MR. KELLY: I'm prepared to accept the general

that has to be done, the general treatment of it. I think

the board.

MR. DUNN: I think we should consider the

this section, and if we approve this section we should

will forget the rest. I'll be no party to approving this.

This is a serious problem here because this is going into

this body which is going to be responsible for the

looking at it as a problem as an individual. Nobody

can get up a resolution, and the body doesn't want to vote

on it. The point of the matter is, it's not wrong.

CHURCHMAN: I think we should consider the

be forced to examine his underdrawers.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think that this station (referring to Judiciary Square) shows up what Sasaki was pointing out, which is really confusion of ideas. You have this kind of baroque thing. It just seems to me this has not been thought through with a basic idea. I think if we okay this, we're okaying this whole confusion. I realize, you know, we get into these problems and clients pressing, and you have to go ahead.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: We can ignore that in this case.

MRS. SAARINEN: But I think this is more important than that pressure, so I would vote not to approve it on the basis of certain problems.

MR. ROSZAK: I have the general impression when Harry Weese was sitting there and listening to Gordon, he understood what he was talking about.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Oh, sure.

MR. ROSZAK: I also think that the whole matter is a matter of taste, and I think finally what we are really up against is that the wrong man is doing the job.

MR. BUNSHAFT: Hear, hear! That's the whole thing in a nutshell.

MR. KELLY: This is a serious detail that bothers me. By definition, these points have the biggest traffic. It seems to me if he does this mezzanine system, he can't

be turned to examine his understanding.

MRS. GARRISON: I think that last session (or session)

to Judiciary Square) shows up what people are thinking and

which is really a condition of ideas. You have this kind of

thought going on. I feel sure to me that this has been the

throughout with a basic idea. I think it is very clear, what

concerning this whole situation. I realize, you know, we are

into these problems and it is a great deal, and you have to go

ahead.

CHRISTIAN WATSON: We can ignore that in this case.

MRS. GARRISON: But I think this is more important

than that because so I would not be opposed to on the

of certain problems.

MR. ROBERT: I think the general impression was

that there was a little more and listening to them, the

understanding was not the best thing.

CHRISTIAN WATSON: No, not.

MR. ROBERT: I think that the whole matter is

rather of fact, and I think finally what we are really up

against is that the whole thing is done.

MR. ROBERT: Yes, that's the whole thing.

a mistake.

MR. KELLY: This is a serious matter, that's

not. By definition, these things have the same effect.

It seems to me that we have this meaning, we can't

stay inside his boundary. The biggest trouble with the New York system and a lot of systems like it is precisely that you get followed up and almost pushed into the track system. That is where the platform must be the widest. That's just a detail, I think.

MR. BUNSHAFT: To come to the nub of this, Ted just said it. When I said you're asking Picasso to do a Mondrian -- this man is a folksy fellow, very nice guy, and if he had all the money in the world he'd still want this. I'm telling you what he's talking about is rebuilding the New York subway. There's no difference in that drawing right there on top and the New York subway. In fact, the New York subway has some dirty tile, but this would be drearier in a couple years because that ceiling is nothing but girders, whether it's concrete or steel. It's the same old subway construction.

There is something that a subway ought to be that is not in these. This is bits and pieces.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: You have both stated your positions eloquently. I'd like to hear from other members, if I may.

Mr. Warnecke, would you express an opinion?

MR. WARNECKE: I just think that you've got an architect here who is going along with the system and exploring in a certain direction; and we better go down a certain road with him and see how well he can do it. He made it quite clear

they handle his country. The speaker would not be

The first speaker said a lot of things that it is impossible to

you get followed up and almost buried into the system.

That is what the speaker was on the whole. That is what

is what I think.

MR. BURNETT: To come to the end of this. To

come to the end. When I said that the speaker was to do a

statement -- this was a fairly long, very long

and it had all the money in the world and still was

this. I'm telling you what he's saying about it. He's

the New York subway. There is a difference in the working

right there on top and the New York subway. In fact, the

the New York subway has some dirt, but it would be different

in a couple of years because the selling is nothing but glass

which is a concrete or steel. It's the same old subway

system.

There is something that is a subway system to be that

is not in there. This is the end of the

CHAIRMAN: You have been asked your question

individually. I'd like to say that the speaker, if I may

MR. BURNETT: Would you express my opinion?

MR. BURNETT: I just think that you're not in

position that is kind along with the system and what

ing in a certain direction and he says he says a certain

when you get out you will see that. It is a very

he does not want to elect to explore that this is an indoor lobby of a building, say aluminum and lighting as if you're in another environment or a big room. He is expressing structure, and we have to either like or dislike the structure and either like or dislike the concrete. We know it is going to maintain well, and so far we don't fully like, I guess, what we've seen. We've got to get a better design in this media or this approach. It is a concrete tube is what he is telling us.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: A perfectly good statement.

Mr. Sasaki.

MR. SASAKI: Well, he doesn't do a tremendous amount of harm by this drawing (indicating) because this drawing is the same as this (indicating) and when you look at this, it looks like a system, so I think he has given some thought.

Now we may disagree with this rounded track or something. It would be interesting, I think, to ask him to come up with a model showing a typical section here, a portion of this system, and maybe a portion of this kind of system (indicating), because then what this will do is force him to come up with some precise sort of response, in response to our previous question what did he want for continuity. He comes up with "elements of continuity." He did this on a plane coming up here and sent it to the Xerox, you know, kind of thing; and I think a subway system is more serious than that, and

he does not want to alert to a place that this is an indoor

lobby or a building, say aluminum and lighting as if you're

in another environment or a big room. He is expressing

anxiety, and we have to allow him to handle the situation

and either live or die. He is not a person. He is a person.

to maintain well, and to let us don't fully. I guess

what we're doing. We're not to let a better feeling in this

room or this situation. I think we're doing it. It is what we

feeling is.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: A perfectly good statement.

Mr. Bessie.

MR. BARNETT: Well, he doesn't do a tremendous amount

with this drawing (indicating) because the drawing is the

same as this (indicating) and when you look at this, it

looks like a system, so I think he has given some thought

Now we may disagree with this rounded shape or some

thing. It would be interesting. I think he has a good

idea with a model showing a typical section here, a portion of

the system, and maybe a portion of this kind of system (indicating)

too, because then what this will be in fact, and to show up

also some physical part by response, he responded to our

previous question when he said by continuing. He seems

up with "elements of continuity." He did this in a place

coming up here and now it is the same. You know, from 17

and I think a student system is more serious than that, and

we ought really to demand more. We have a right to, I think. Knowing Harry, I think he is serious enough a person to respond this way. We just need to be a little more firm.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: That is a perfectly good statement. Now Mr. Kelly, you have said some, and certainly the sense of this meeting is while certain members have grave reservations about his being the correct architect, for the purpose of our reply to the National Capital Transportation Agency, I suggest we tell them we think it's not been studied thoroughly enough; that we would with a model; that we've raised grave questions of basic design, and therefore cannot approve this station as it stands, and that we would like further serious studies and presentations made to us.

MR. WARNECKE: I second that.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Are there any objections? You can expand it, Gordon. We can't attack him personally.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I understand that.

MRS. SAARINEN: I think it should be amended to say "models of the three different systems." I think that should be specifically stated.

MR. SASAKI: And large enough so we can see some of the details.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: All right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: May I say something?

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Yes. If it's brief.

we must really be doing more. It is a right to I think. Knowing that, I think we are serious enough to get on to respond this way. We must mean to do a little more than.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: That is a particularly good statement. Now Mr. Kelly, you have said some, and certainly the same of this meeting is while certain members have given testimony about his being the correct one, for the purpose of not reply to the National Capital Transportation Agency.

I suggest we tell them we think it's not been established thoroughly enough; that we would with a model; that we've raised some questions of legal design, and therefore cannot approve this station as it stands, and that we would like further serious studies and recommendations made to us.

MR. WATSON: I second that. CHAIRMAN WATSON: Are there any objections? You can expand it, Gordon. We can't attack the personality.

MR. BURNETT: I understand that. MR. GARDNER: I think it would be wrong to say "models of the three different systems." I think we should be specifically stated.

MR. BURNETT: And I agree enough so we can see some of the details.

CHAIRMAN WATSON: All right. MR. BURNETT: May I say something? CHAIRMAN WATSON: Yes. It is all right.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think this is the most important thing we have gotten in the last four years, and I think an ordinary owner, if they had an architect and did not like the direction he was going, would ask him to do some alternates. Seriously, that's what would happen. You would not fire the architect.

CHAIRMAN WALTON: Certainly.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I think what we ought to say is what Bill said, and I'd add to it this, that we think -- and I would use the word -- I think the project has the feeling -- and I think you're being kind, because we all know what Harry has done, whether it is sloppy or not, that the thing tends to be a bit folksy, and we would like to see alternates of a more precise nature or precise approach.

MR. WARNECKE: I think you have to be very precise. I think you have to take this business of advertising and every one of you say, "We don't want advertising." Let's take issue by issue.

MR. BUNSHAFT: I'm not saying that.

MRS. SAARINEN: That's not our job.

MR. BUNSHAFT: If Kevin Roche were doing this, it would be an entirely different thing and would all be rational, too, and probably would be much more exciting, so I say a more precise approach. Alternates. I think the thing is alternates.

MR. BUNSWORTH: I think there is no need to say that.

which he has gotten to the last point, and I think he
originally meant to say that they had an agreement and did not
direction he was going, would ask him to do some alterations.
naturally, that's what would happen. The whole of the
the situation.

CHARLES WATSON: Certainly.

MR. BUNSWORTH: I think what we want to say
is what Bill said, and I'd add to it that what we think --
and I would use the word -- I think the probabilities are
failing -- and I think you're going to find out all about
Hasty one time, whether it is a supply of that, and the thing
failing to be a big thing, and we would like to see if it
it is more practical matter or not, or not.

MR. BUNSWORTH: I think you have to be very precise.
I think you have to take into account the possibility of
every one of you say, we don't want to do that. That's
the issue of the day.

MR. BUNSWORTH: I'm not saying that.

MR. BUNSWORTH: That's not our job.

MR. BUNSWORTH: I think you have to be very precise.

which he is entirely different thing and would all be different,
too, and probably would be when more serious, as I say a more
practical approach. I think the thing is different.

23 August 1967

Dear Mr. McCarter:

We got your news release yesterday regarding final design contracts on the Judiciary Square and G Street stations.

The selection of Ammann and Whitney and Kent Cooper seems like an excellent choice, and we look forward to working with them on these two projects. As you know, the Commission has not approved the direction that Harry Weese is pursuing in the variety of station designs presented for our consideration. So far no single clear concept has been developed. We hope that working with Weese and the new consultants will result in some good ideas that will be able to carry a strong design throughout the entire system. Certainly the opportunity is there.

The Commission is meeting on the 20th of September or thereabouts and we would be glad to meet with you, General Graham and the consultants at that time.

Sincerely yours,

C. H. Atherton
Secretary

Mr. Walter J. McCarter
Administrator
National Capital Transportation Agency
1634 Eye Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

EXHIBIT A

2 August 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts approves the design for the Multi-Climate Building at the National Zoo which was presented at our meeting on June 21st. It's a good strong solution and provides a much needed focal point in an area that is now too loosely strung together. The Commission particularly welcomes the architect's effort to minimize the structure by setting it into the hillside and sloping the natural landscape around three sides of the building. This, of course, is a principle that the Commission has urged for new construction at the Zoo--emphasis on the natural landscape and deemphasis of buildings.

We look forward to following the progress of this and other projects at the Zoo.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT B

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

3 August 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts approves the design of the two parking facilities on the grounds of the National Institute of Health, which were presented at our June 21st meeting. These buildings are an encouraging step toward meeting the parking problem at National Institute of Health. Possibly it can set an example for other Federal establishments.

The designs of both projects are commendable. The only suggestion the Commission has is to increase the density of trees surrounding the buildings in order to provide additional screening, and the bigger the trees are, the better. The type of trees, of course, should be the same that prevail on the rest of the campus.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT C

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

3 August 1967

Dear Mr. Knott:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered a Master Plan study and design for a new high-rise dormitory on the campus at Gallaudet College at its meeting on June 21st.

The study appeared to be very superficial; little thought had been given to the three dimensional aspects of the Master Plan, especially the way the new building would relate to the original quadrangle which is the formal core of the school. Before the Commission considers any new designs, the architect should prepare a simple model showing existing buildings and new developments. We stress the word "simple". The model should be for working purposes and not embellished with unnecessary details. We also recommend that in addition to preparing the model, more thought is given to the design of the dormitory complex. The one shown to the Commission was not very impressive.

The next meeting of the Commission is scheduled for the 20th of September, and we would be happy to review any new material at that time.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Lawson B. Knott, Jr.
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington, D.C.

EXHIBIT D

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Airis:

The Commission of Fine Arts submits its report on the design for the South Leg Tunnel of the Inner Loop Freeway which it considered at its meeting on June 21.

Several important features of the plan should be reconsidered. Foremost is the need for preservation of the trees bordering the reflecting pool. This planting forms an essential part of the setting of both the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument and should not be disturbed or damaged in any way. This also applies to the reflecting pool itself.

Secondly, the two large ventilating shafts situated near both ends of the tunnel are unsightly and badly mar the area, especially around the Lincoln Memorial. The Commission recommends study of a single outlet located near the center of the tunnel and of considerably lower proportions so that it will not compete with any of the nearby monuments.

The western entrance to the tunnel should be moved further away from the Lincoln Memorial, and the portal walls, rails and lighting should be kept as simple as possible.

This portion of the Inner Loop System is by far the most sensitive in terms of design and method of construction, and every effort must be made to resolve the above points.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Thomas F. Airis
D. C. Department of Highways and Traffic
District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT E

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Jett:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the Douglass Community Center at its June 21st meeting.

For a small recreation building, the solution seemed entirely too complex in every respect - interior and exterior alike. Despite the architects' sincerity in explaining the design, one cannot help getting the impression he is straining for effect.

This is not to deny the validity of much of what the designer is trying to achieve. On the contrary, the Commission believes that with a little discipline and order a fairly good solution can be developed.

Since the meeting the Commission staff has already gone over these points at considerable length with the architect, so the Commission's criticism should certainly be clear.

We indicated that we would be glad to consider new studies at any time.

Sincerely yours,



William Walton
Chairman

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20242

cc: Mr. Joseph H. Cole
D. C. Recreation Dept.

EXHIBIT F

July 13, 1967

Dear Mr. Jett:

The Commission of Fine Arts considered designs for the relandscaping of Columbia Island at its June 20th and 21st meeting.

Generally speaking, the plan is acceptable except for the formalized area around the large circular pool and fountain. The character of the planting here may conflict with that of the Memorial Drive and the entrance to Arlington Cemetery itself. The landscape architect agreed to make further studies which we will be glad to look over any time.

We also discussed the character of the fountain but came to no conclusions at the meeting, except to urge that a pool be constructed as soon as possible. This will head off any efforts to remove this circle, which as you know, has been suggested many times.

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. T. Sutton Jett
Regional Director
National Capital Region
National Park Service
1100 Ohio Drive, S. W.
Washington, D. C. 20242

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

WILLIAM WALTON, Chairman

GORDON BUNSHAFT

ALINE B. SAARINEN

BURNHAM KELLY

HIDEO SASAKI

THEODORE ROSZAK

JOHN CARL WARNECKE

CHARLES H. ATHERTON, Secretary

July 12, 1967

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Green:

After careful consideration the Commission of Fine Arts has disapproved a design for the Headquarters Building of the American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, N. W. The overriding consideration of the Commission is the relationship of any new structure to the historic Octagon Building and garden. In this respect we feel the two structures are completely incompatible. The proscenium-like frame rising some 90' high would make the Octagon appear like a toy or a piece of stage furniture, an unsuitable setting for one of the most historic structures in Washington. The proposed building would be far too assertive on this limited site and thus violate the harmony which the Commission feels is the principle precept to be followed in designing new structures for the Capital.

The Commission's reasons for disapproving this project could be expanded and therefore we have indicated to representatives of the Institute of Architects that we will be glad to discuss our action in greater detail and to explore other directions and alternatives.

Sincerely yours,



William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Julian P. Green
Assistant Superintendent
of Licenses and Permits
106 District Building
Washington, D. C. 20004

EXHIBIT H

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

3 August 1967

Dear Mr. Sherman:

This will confirm the Commission of Fine Art's disapproval of the revised design for the roof of the new Federal Reserve Board Building which we considered at our June 21st meeting.

The penthouse is still too awkward and heavy in appearance. The Commission's recommendations at the meeting were simple and, in our view, practical as well. Although the architect argued the difficulty of relocating the mechanical equipment now on the roof, there are always alternative solutions. Other than this one feature, the building is an excellent design and it would be regrettable if it were to be spoiled unnecessarily.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

William Walton
Chairman

Mr. Merritt Sherman
Secretary
Board of Governors of the
Federal Reserve System
Washington, D.C. 20551

EXHIBIT I

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
21 June 1967

AM

9:30

I. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

9:30

1. National Capital Transportation Agency

Subway Designs

10:00

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

a. F.B.I. Building - Revised Design

b. National Zoological Park, Multi-Climate Building

c. National Institutes of Health, Multi-level Parking Facilities

d. Gallaudet College Dormitory Building - Proposed Design

10:30

3. D.C. Government, Department of Highways and Traffic

Inner Loop Freeway, South Leg Tunnel

11:00

4. Department of the Interior, National Park Service

a. Ellipse Walks and Fountains

b. Douglass Community Center Building, 20th Street north
of Stanton Terrace, S.E.

c. Columbia Island Landscaping

11:30

5. D.C. Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

American Institute of Architects Headquarters Building -
Revised Design

12:00

6. Federal Reserve Board

New Federal Reserve Board Building, C Street Between 20th
and 21st Streets, N.W.

